REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-32 remain in the application with claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 15, 22, and 24 having been amended hereby and claim 4 having been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-19, and 22-32, under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Lection et al. in view of Sorge et al.

As previously explained, the present invention is intended to permit the use of a limited capability device to display information typically displayed on a nonlimited capability device. In other words, a display that would be at home on a personal computer is not at home in a cellular telephone and, thus, some diminishing of the image capabilities must be provided. The limited capability device, as noted, can be a cell phone or a personal digital assistant (PDA) and "the desired information" may be web page information obtained by a personal computer over the internet. As is well-known, the formats of web pages are diverse so the user is forced to use different data extraction methods and different methods from content to content to reorganize the data for display on the cell phone. The data converter of the information processing apparatus converts data in a variety of formats into a format displayable on the mobile terminal.

A processing condition data area of the information processing apparatus contains processing condition data added

by the processing controller. The processing condition data includes shaping conditions, such as character count per line and image size, etc. The processing condition data area has a data structure containing a plurality of categories, each storing a plurality of pieces of processing condition data. Upon analyzing the page data, the page data shaping unit extracts data, such as text data and image data, to be sent to the mobile terminal in accordance with the processing condition data. Page data shaping unit then converts image data of various formats, for example, JPEG or GIF, into the black and white binary bit map data that is suitable for display on the mobile terminal.

The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize the above-noted features of the present invention.

Lection et al. relates to the use of displays in so-called pervasive computing devices, which Lection et al. states are generally more limited in size than the displays typically available on personal computers. More specifically, Lection et al. relates to displaying a so-called multifunction application launcher view and enabling the user of the device to navigate between such a launcher view and selected ones of a plurality of task views. In other words, Lection et al. relates to providing the user a display and letting the user change the display. All of this displaying is going on with the so-called pervasive computing device and not between a personal computer and such a computing device. Specifically, Lection et al. provides an approach in which multiple functions can be performed for a particular task from the

single view in the overall grid.

As noted by the examiner, Lection et al. is deficient in a number of areas provided by the present invention and Sorge et al. is cited to cure those deficiencies. Nevertheless, it is respectfully noted that Lection et al. not only is deficient in certain areas but Lection et al. does not even relate to the same problem being solved by the present invention.

Sorge et al. relates to a program that permits restoring data tables or charts in an HTML document after the data tables or charts have been changed or published. As noted in Sorge et al., a data chart or data table loses its computational functionality once it is exported from a spreadsheet application into an HTML document. Sorge et al. attempts to remedy that problem and creates a unique identifier that is associated with the data that are translated and inserted into the HTML document, so that subsequently the associated data can be retrieved and refreshed.

It is respectfully submitted that this system of Sorge et al. does not relate to changing the size of a display so that it may be displayed on a cellular telephone, for example, by having shaping conditions that include character count per line and image size limitations, for example, as taught by the presently claimed invention.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion in either reference of any benefits to be had by

making the combination of selected portions of the two references as proposed by the examiner. Neither Lection et al. nor Sorge et al. are confronted with the problem solved by the present invention and, thus, neither reference provides any suggestion as to how to overcome such a problem.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 11, 20, and 21 as being unpatentable over Lection et al. in view of Sorge et al. and further in view of Serbinis et al.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 12, which independent claims are thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 11, 20, and 21 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Serbinis et al. is sited for its use of the words "expiration date", as comprising metadata concerning other information.

Nevertheless, Serbinis et al. does not cure the deficiencies of the primary and secondary references concerning disclosure of the actual steps taught by the present invention and recited in the respective independent claims.

Accordingly, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted a file conversion method and apparatus as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited

references, alone or in combination.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:gdl